

**REMARKS**

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for examining the pending application. The Office Action dated December 3, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 4-8 and 14-19 are rejected.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanuma et al. (US 5,917,569) in view of Takato et al. (US 6,445,434), and rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanuma et al. (US 5,917,569) in view of Takato et al. (US 6,445,434) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Ishii (US 6,133,974).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 and deleted claims 5 and 6 to further define the invention. No new matter has been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C 103(a)**

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "rubbing the first alignment film of the upper plate through the first mask according to one rubbing direction; and rubbing the second alignment film of the lower plate according to the one rubbing direction, wherein the opening regions of the first mask

on the first alignment film corresponds to the blocking regions of the second mask on the second alignment film respectively, and the blocking regions of the first mask on the first alignment film corresponds to the opening regions of the second mask on the second alignment film respectively; wherein the first alignment film of the upper plate and the second alignment film of the lower plate are rubbed according to the same rubbing direction; wherein after the upper and lower plates are assembled, the first and second alignment films have opposite rubbing directions in adjacent liquid crystal cells; and wherein the ferroelectric liquid crystal material in the adjacent liquid crystal cells is rotated to opposite spontaneous polarization direction.”

Claim 8 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 8 recites a combination of elements including for example, “rubbing a first alignment film of the upper plate through the first mask along a first direction; rubbing a second alignment film of the lower plate through the second mask along the first direction, wherein the opening regions of the first mask on the first alignment film corresponds to blocking regions of the second mask on the second alignment film respectively, and the opening regions of the second mask on the second alignment film corresponds to blocking regions of the first mask on the first alignment film respectively; wherein the first alignment film of the upper plate and the second alignment film of the lower plate are rubbed according to the same rubbing direction; wherein after the upper and lower plates are assembled, the first and second alignment films have opposite rubbing directions in adjacent liquid crystal cells; and wherein the ferroelectric liquid crystal material in the adjacent liquid crystal cells is rotated to opposite spontaneous polarization direction.”

In Tanuma, a rubbing process of the same alignment film 15A is rubbed using a plurality of first resist masks 23 and a plurality of second resist masks 24. On the contrary, in the claimed

invention, a rubbing process of a first alignment film is rubbed using a first mask, while a rubbing process of a second alignment film is rubbed using a second mask.

In addition, in Tanuma, first alignment film 15A is firstly rubbed to a first direction and is secondly rubbed to a second direction opposite to the first direction. On the contrary, in the claimed invention, all of first and second alignment films are rubbed to the same rubbing direction.

In particular, in the claimed invention, the ferroelectric liquid crystal material in the adjacent liquid crystal cells is rotated to opposite spontaneous polarization direction. However, Tanuma fails to disclose at least this feature of the claimed invention.

None of the cited references singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 and 14-19 are allowable over the cited references.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing Amendment Accompanied by RCE, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.


If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested, and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: February 20, 2009

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Mary Jane Bpswell  
Reg. No. 33,652

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: 202-739-3000  
Fax: 202-739-3001